

have \$250 million or larger in assets—and we are cutting Nutrition Programs and School Lunch Programs and WIC Programs.

In the other end of that, they want to give capital gains tax breaks which will go to the richest 1 or 2 or 3 percent in this country, in large part. The great majority of capital gains, 87 percent of capital gains cuts, go to the wealthiest people in this country.

This whole Contract With America disturbs me, Mr. Speaker, because it is transferring money from the middle class to the rich. It doesn't make sense and I ask for the defeat of the rescission bill this week.

#### UNHEALTHY KIDS DO NOT MAKE A STRONG AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many of my Republican colleagues were busy this past weekend, as were by colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle. I wish some of my Republican colleagues who have proposed these cuts in programs might have accompanied me on my trip through Illinois.

My first stop was at a convention in Chicago sponsored by the Illinois Education Association, one of the largest groups of teachers in our State. Almost a thousand teachers met for a 3- or 4-day conference in Chicago to talk about issues on their mind.

I sat down for breakfast in Chicago with Gary Jones, a high school teacher in Troy, and Cindy Klickna from Springfield, IL, and I said, "What is different about this convention?" And they said, "The budget moved through quickly and we are glad to see that. But there is another thing that started coming up in the course of these conversations which is becoming more and more popular." And I said, "What is that?" And they said, "Security in schools."

Teachers who for years have been meeting and talking, scarcely talked about the question of security of teachers and students in schools. But now it has become an issue of paramount importance, not only in the city of Chicago but across the State.

All of us understand as we read in the newspaper about violence among kids. Children bringing knives and guns to school. Unfortunate and tragic incidents involving injury and death, schoolchildren one to another and threats to teachers. This is today's reality.

The reason why this is relevant is that this week on this floor of this House of Representatives we will be considering a Republican rescission bill, which is a spending cut bill, which will cut money for what is known as Safe and Drug-Free Schools. Money that we have put into a special account in the Federal Government to give to

school districts to figure out ways to make it safer for our children and grandchildren to go to school.

I wish we didn't have to do this. I wish we could put the money into computers and teachers. But every one of us knows in our heart of hearts that more than anything we want our kids coming home at the end of the day safe. Safe. And yet we are going to cut millions of dollars out of that.

The Republicans believe this is thoughtful; this is sensible. They don't think this investment is necessary. I wish a few of them could sit down with the teachers in today's schools who will tell you that taking the weapons out of schools, stopping the fighting in schools, and ending the drugs that are starting to permeate all of our kids' culture is really the key to security and the key to America's future and readiness.

I went back to Springfield, IL, which is in my district, and had another meeting and this meeting consisted of people representing the WIC Program, day-care homes, and school lunch programs. My friend the gentleman from Ohio, SHERROD BROWN, has talked about the school lunch program. I will not dwell on it.

At that meeting we talked a lot about what day care means to working mothers and fathers. A young couple in their 20's came in to see me with their children; one was 3 and another in a toddler seat. Both of them are working, and that is not unusual in America today, and they depend on quality day care to take care of their kids while they are off to work.

The Republican proposal on welfare reform is going to cut the nutrition grants which we give to day-care centers and homes across America. This is in the name of saving money. What these families told me was: Congressman, if the cost of day care gets up too high, it does not make sense to work. We are working to pay day care. We want to work. We want to pay taxes and we want to improve our lives and buy our homes and prepare for our future. But do not make an additional burden on day care, which is literally going to pull the plug on a lot of working families.

In Quincy, a week ago, there was a woman working 45 hours a week in fast food who had her daughter in day care who said, "If you are going to raise my day care bill 20 percent, I have to stop and really think does this make sense anymore?"

In the midst of a welfare debate we should be encouraging people to work. We should be helping them to stay on the job. We should not be increasing the overhead costs of going to work.

The same thing is true on the WIC Program. Here is a program which is a dramatic success—40 percent—40 percent of the infants in America are in our Federal WIC Program. And you know why it is such a big program? It works.

We have dropped the infant death rate in America. It should go even

lower, but we have dropped it dramatically because we bring in pregnant mothers. You meet early on with a counselor who says, "Here are the things you should put in your diet to have a healthy baby. And here are the things to avoid: Alcohol, narcotics and tobacco, especially."

And it works. We know it works. It is a proven success. And yet, the Republicans are coming in with their new vision of America to cut out these programs and reduce the amount of money we put in them. You know when we are going pay for that cut? Generations to come. Unhealthy kids do not build a strong America. We have got to stick with the programs that work. And I hope my Republican colleagues will get back to their districts and take a look around.

#### THE RESCISSION BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will consider the rule and the bill on rescissions. That \$17 billion cut will begin to fundamentally change the way the Federal Government acts and responds, but more importantly, will begin to change the fundamental way we respond to Americans.

While I suspect both will pass, I intend to oppose both the rule and the bill. The rule is too restrictive. First, it only allows the restoration of programs through other cuts within the same chapter. And second, the rule restricts cuts to those programs already proposed to be cut. In short, the rule is designed to ensure that the disproportion in cuts proposed cannot be changed.

According to the analysis of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, low-income people will bear 63 percent of the cuts, where they only account for 12 percent. And over 12 percent of the total budget is paying 63 percent of the cuts proposed. The rule makes it virtually impossible to correct that imbalance of the shift of more burdens to the poor.

I cannot support such a rule, Mr. Speaker. Again, I cannot support such a rule that reverses in such a basic and elemental way the way in which we provide for the quality of life for the poor that Americans have come to expect and in fact, have come to rely upon.

The rescission bill would change how poor people eat, where poor people live, and where the poor people work, and what they can learn, and where they can travel, and how poor people can attend to their health care when they are in need.

It should be noted that the quality of life for poor people cannot be changed